

[2nd March 1926]

(c) whether the ryots dug the same and also the channel, as per estimates, for about 3,000 feet, at a cost of Rs. 6,000, paying the same out of their own pockets; and

(d) whether it is a fact that Government did not as yet take up the work and whether the channel has consequently 'filled up'?

A.—The Government have no information but have asked the Chief Engineer to furnish it.

Proposed dam across the jungle stream near Seshanchavadi village.

1498 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the ryots of Muthampatti and Kattu-veppilapatti, in Salem taluk, applied to Government some time back for putting up a dam across the jungle stream near the Seshanchavadi village and to open canals for irrigating the said villages and whether the matter was investigated by Government;

(b) whether any further action has been taken in the matter by Government and in what stage the matter is; and

(c) if the scheme has been abandoned the reasons therefor?

A.—The Government have no information.

Construction of a reservoir near Melarasambut village.

1499 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasaya: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether there are any proposals before Government to construct a reservoir by joining the two ridges of two ranges of hills to the south of Melarasambut village in Vellore taluk (North Arcot)?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

Land Revenue.

A memorial from some inamdars of Kasimkota.

1500 Q.—Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a memorial from some inamdars of Kasimkota, Anakapalle taluk, Vizagapatam district;

(b) whether it is a fact that the resumption order of the Ummadi Masjid inams according to the B.P. No. 1403 of 13th April 1897 was applied also to Phoktu or Pure Masjid inams of the memorialists, and that they were resumed together with the Ummadi Masjid inams;

(c) what the nature of the tenure of these Phoktu inams was when they were resumed, and whether they were considered as service inams and if so, on what grounds;

(d) assuming that these Phoktu inams were intended as service inams, whether the Government was justified in asking the inamdars to quit their lands wholesale;

2nd March 1926]

(e) why the principle applied to the karnam's service inams was not made applicable also in this case and the lands placed in the possession of the owners;

(f) if these inams are considered service inams, whether any duties were stated to be performed by these inamdars;

(g) whether any remuneration was paid to the inamdars on the resumption of the lands; and

(h) whether the Government will be pleased to call for a full report from the District Collector, Vizagapatam, particularly on the question of occupancy rights of these inamdars, and whether they will be pleased to do justice to the claims of the inamdars?

A.—(a) The Government have received a memorial from certain persons who claim to have once enjoyed certain lands as inam in the Kasinkota estate.

(b) All the masjid grants in Kasinkota estate were resumed about 1897.

(c) The grants were held by the Board of Revenue to be of the nature of service yeomiahs consisting of a share of produce. In some cases they consisted of a share of the produce of specific plots, in which case they were termed 'phoktu'; in others the land a share of the produce of which was assigned was not localized in which case the grants were termed 'ummadi'.

(d) & (e) The view held was that they were not inam lands but yeomiah grants. The Inam Commissioner in 1863 decided that they were not inam grants and did not settle them.

(f) No service was being rendered by any body at the time of resumption and the lands were held by alienees.

(g) No remuneration was paid to any body.

(h) The case of these grants was fully examined by the Government in 1909 and they decided that there were no grounds for revising the action taken by the Board of Revenue. Persons who thought themselves aggrieved filed a suit unsuccessfully against the Government and the proprietor in 1911. The Government do not propose to reopen the case.

Assignment of land to military pensioners in Palavanchattu village.

1501 Q.—MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether Government are proceeding to assign a portion of the wet ayacut land in the 'eri' in No. 117 Palavanchattu village in Vellore taluk of the North Arcot district to military pensioners; and

(b) if so, whether they have consulted the wishes and the interests of the ryots of the said village when proceeding to make this assignment?

A.—The Government have no information of any such proposal. The land is presumably assessed wastes and its assignment to military pensioners is within the powers of the Collector.